APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/912,852	07/24/2001	Andy T. Huey	CISCO-3572	5861

7590	09/20/2004	**EXAMINER**

Timothy A. Brisson
Sierra Patent Group
P.O. Box 6149
Stateline, NV 89449

MARTINEZ, DAVID E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2182	

DATE MAILED: 09/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/912,852	HUEY ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	David E Martinez	2182	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>24 July 2001</u>.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.　　2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-17* is/are pending in the application.
　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) *1-6,10-17* is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) *7-9* is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>24 July 2001</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
　　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
　　a)☐ All　b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
　　　1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
　　　2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
　　　3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
　　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)
1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>6/26/02</u>.
4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent No.

6,415,314 to Fee et al. (Fee).

With regards to claim 4, Fee teaches an ICS [fig 1-3] comprising:

an Ethernet backplane [figs 2, 3 column 5 lines 60-67 (fig 3 element smb10)];

at least one internal ICS chassis occupant operatively coupled to said backplane

[figs 1-3 "module" elements, column 4 lines 3-11]; and

wherein said at least one internal chassis occupant is configured to assign IP

addresses [column 6 lines 21-43].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, and 10-14, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

US Patent Application Publication No. US 2004/0015958A1 to Zara et al. (Zara). In view of US

Patent No. 6,415,314 to Fee et al. (Fee).

1.   With regards to claims 1, 10, and 12, Zara teaches in an Integrated Communications

System ("ICS") [paragraph 19 "node has been bolted into a rack" (rack being the ICS)] having

an Ethernet backplane [paragraph 19, node in a rack "plugged to power and networking"], a

method for assigning an IP address to at least one internal ICS chassis occupant [paragraphs 4

and 19] comprising:

        receiving a request for an IP address from a component [paragraphs 4, 15, 17,

19];

        determining whether said request was received from one of the said at least one

internal chassis occupant [paragraphs 20, 21, checking if the MAC address belongs to

the "rack node" (internal chassis occupant)]; and

        assigning an IP address to at least one internal chassis occupant if said request

was received from one of said at least one internal chassis occupant [paragraph 4, 19

assignment under the condition that the MAC address of the node is allowed to be

configured].

        Zara teaches all of the above limitations except explicitly for the ICS having an

Ethernet Backplane. However, Zara does say the node in a rack being plugged into

"power and networking" thus hinting at being plugged into an Ethernet backplane. Fee

teaches the use of an Ethernet backplane within a chassis having slot cards for the

benefit of being able to manage each of the slot cards from the outside of the chassis

[column 2 lines 41-47 and column 5 lines 60-67 (fig 3 element smb10)].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to combine the teachings of both Zara and Fee to provide the ICS with an

Ethernet backplane for the benefit of being able to manage each of the slot cards from

the outside of the chassis.

2.   With regards to claims 2, and 13, Zara teaches the method of Claim 1, wherein the said

act of determining whether said request was received from one of the said at least one internal

chassis occupant further includes:

querying if a System Switch Processor has recorded a MAC address for the said

at least one internal chassis occupant [fig 2 step 230, paragraphs 4 and 20 "the management

system will compare the MAC sent by the node with all the MACs that are known"].

3.   With regards to claims 3, 11, and 14, Zara teaches the method of Claim 1, further

including the act of ignoring said IP address request [fig 2 steps 230 and 235, paragraph 20, if

the MAC address is not known, the node within the chassis is not further configured (ignored)

and then further diagnosed] and returning to act of receiving a next IP address request if said

component is not an internal chassis occupant [paragraph 15, the management module listens

for network configuration requests (ip requests) of mac addresses from any node whenever a

new node unit is installed].

Claims 5-6, and 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

US Patent No. 6,415,314 to Fee et al. (Fee). in view of US Patent Application Publication No.

US 2004/0015958A1 to Zara et al. (Zara).

4.   With regards to claim 5 Fee discloses a management system being one of the modules,

performing module configuration inside of the chassis [column 1 lines 36-42, column 2 lines 28-

47], Fee fails to teach the ICS of Claim 4, wherein said at least one chassis occupant is further

configured to receive a request for an IP address from a component, determine whether said request was received from one of said at least one internal chassis occupant, and assign an IP address to at least one internal chassis occupant if said request was received from one of said at least one internal chassis occupant.

However Zara teaches a management system configuring internal rack modules from outside of the chassis configured to:

receive a request for an IP address from a component [paragraphs 4, 15, 17, 19];

determine whether said request was received from one of said at least one internal chassis occupant [paragraphs 20, 21, checking if the MAC address belongs to the "rack node" (internal chassis occupant)]; and

assign an IP address to at least one internal chassis occupant if said request was received from one of said at least one internal chassis occupant [paragraph 4, 19 assignment under the condition that the MAC address of the node is allowed to be configured] all for the benefit of providing a more efficient configuration process that requires less use of skilled workers and increases the reliability of the configuration job and time to deployment components [Zara paragraphs 4-6].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of both Fee and Zara to receive a request for an IP address from a component, determine whether said request was received from one of said at least one internal chassis occupant, and assign an IP address to at least one internal chassis occupant if said request was received from one of said at least one internal chassis occupant for the benefit of providing a more efficient configuration process that requires less use of skilled workers and increases the reliability of the configuration job and time to deployment components. Furthermore, It would have been

obvious to combine the teachings of both Fee and Zara to have the management system

being a module inside as a node inside the chassis for the benefit of system integration

which would reduce the cost of purchasing external management equipment.

5.   With regards to claim 6, Fee teaches the ICS of Claim 5, wherein said ICS is comprised

of eight card slots [fig 1 elements 10, 14].

6.   With regards to claim 15, Fee teaches an ICS [fig 1-3] having an Ethernet backplane

[figs 2, 3 column 5 lines 60-67 (fig 3 element smb10)], said backplane coupled to at least one

internal ICS chassis occupant [figs 1-3 "module" elements, column 4 lines 3-11], wherein said at

least one internal chassis occupant having an IP address assignment module ("IPAM")

operatively disposed within it [column 6 lines 21-43]. Fee fails to teach a method for assigning

an IP address to said at least one internal chassis occupant comprising:

receiving, by said IPAM, a request for an IP address from a component;

determining, by said IPAM, whether said request was received from one of the

said at least one internal chassis occupant; and

assigning an IP address, by said IPAM, to at least one internal chassis occupant

if said request was received from one of said at least one internal chassis occupant.

However, Zara teaches a management system configuring internal rack modules from

outside of the chassis configured to:

receive a request for an IP address from a component [paragraphs 4, 15, 17, 19];

determine whether said request was received from one of said at least one internal

chassis occupant [paragraphs 20, 21, checking if the MAC address belongs to the "rack

node" (internal chassis occupant)]; and

assign an IP address to at least one internal chassis occupant if said request was

received from one of said at least one internal chassis occupant [paragraph 4, 19 assignment

under the condition that the MAC address of the node is allowed to be configured] all for the benefit of providing a more efficient configuration process that requires less use of skilled workers and increases the reliability of the configuration job and time to deployment components [Zara paragraphs 4-6].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of both Fee and Zara to receive a request for an IP address from a component, determine whether said request was received from one of said at least one internal chassis occupant, and assign an IP address to at least one internal chassis occupant if said request was received from one of said at least one internal chassis occupant for the benefit of providing a more efficient configuration process that requires less use of skilled workers and increases the reliability of the configuration job and time to deployment components. Furthermore, It would have been obvious to combine the teachings of both Fee and Zara to have the management system being a module inside (an "IPAM") as a node inside the chassis for the benefit of system integration which would reduce the cost of purchasing external management equipment.

7.   With regards to claim 16, it's of the same scope as claim 2 above thus rejected under the same rationale.

8.   With regards to claim 17, it's of the same scope as claim 3 above thus rejected under the same rationale.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 7-9 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US Patent No. 5,909,591 to Brooke.

RFC 2131 Dynamic Host Configuration Protocol.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David E Martinez whose telephone number is (703) 305-4890. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey A Gaffin can be reached on (703) 308-3301. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Starting October, the examiner can be reached at the new telephone number (571) 272-4152 and new fax number (571) 273-4152.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DEM

KIM HUYNH
PRIMARY EXAMINER

9/16/04